

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of October 23, 2009, has been reviewed and the following remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 60, 64-66, 68, 72-74, 76-81 and 83-90 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 60-90 are pending upon entry of the present amendment. Entry of the amendments, reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 60-90 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Littig *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,276, “Littig”) in view of Ishigami (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,445, “Ishigami”) and Piosenka *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,926,756, “Piosenka”). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claim 60 recites, *inter alia*,

establishing, at a computing device, a connection between a first mobile communication device and the computing device, wherein the computing device is different from the first mobile communication device;

displaying, at the computing device, a user interface comprising a list of personalized information types;

receiving, through the user interface displayed at the computing device, a user selection of personalized information to transfer from the first mobile communication device to the computing device, wherein the personalized information includes at least one of: settings of the first mobile communication device, a calendar, a phonebook and a message;

receiving user input corresponding to a command to initiate transfer of the selected personalized information from the first mobile communication device to the computing device, wherein the user selection of the personalized information is different from the user input corresponding to the command to initiate transfer and wherein the user selection is received prior to receiving the command to initiate transfer of the selected personalized information;

initiating transfer of the selected personalized information from the first mobile communication device to the computing device in response to receiving the command; and

storing, at the computing device, a backup copy of the personalized information transferred from a memory of the first mobile communication device in a memory of the computing device.

Littig, Ishigami and Piosenka, either separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 60. In rejecting claim 60, the Office Action again asserts at pp. 2-3, para. 4, that the entry of ‘#66#’ and/or ‘#69#’ described in Littig at FIG. 6A constitutes a user selection, at a computing device, of personalized information to transfer from a mobile communication device to the computing device. As previously noted in the Applicants’ Response filed July 28, 2009, Littig clearly states at col. 6, ll. 20-28, that the entry of ‘#69#’ on a first radio merely “enabl[es] the coupled radio to receive data and send data” and entry of ‘#66#’ on a second universal radio merely “enable[es] the radio to send data and receive data.” Simply put, the mere enablement of a radio to send and receive data does not constitute selection of personalized information to transfer from a first mobile communication device to a computing device as recited in claim 60. Claim 60 is thus allowable for at least these reasons.

Furthermore, even assuming, without conceding, that Piosenka describes reading, at a computer, a page from a cellular phone, Piosenka and the other cited documents still fail to teach or suggest storing a backup copy of the received personalized information at the computer. For example, while Piosenka illustrates a “Read Page” button in FIGS. 6 and 8, nowhere does Piosenka teach or suggest that the information read is backed up on the computer. Ishigami describes a system for transferring data from a computing device to a mobile communication device and determining whether search tables can be produced by the mobile communication device. *See, e.g.,* Abstract; *see also* Col. 2, ll. 14-27. Accordingly, even if the data received and stored by the mobile communication device describes a backup copy, it is the mobile device that is storing the backup copy, not the computing device. In contrast, claim 60 recites storing a backup copy of the personalized information at the computing device. Accordingly, claim 60 is allowable for this additional reason.

Amended independent claims 68 and 74 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 60 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 60.

Claims 61-67, 69-73 and 75-77 are dependent on claims 60, 68 and 74, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim.

Amended independent claim 78 recites, *inter alia*,

receiving, at a computing device, a request to write previously stored personalized information stored at the computing device to a first mobile communication device different from the computing device, wherein the

previously stored personalized information is received from a second mobile communication device different from the first mobile communication device;
displaying, at the computing device, a selection interface including a list of a plurality of personalized information previously stored at the computing device, wherein the plurality of previously stored personalized information includes at least one of: mobile communication device settings, a calendar, a phonebook and a message;
receiving, through an input of the computing device, a user selection of the previously stored personalized information from the list of the plurality of previously stored personalized information in the displayed selection interface to send to the first mobile communication device, the input being different from the first mobile communication device; and
upon receiving the user selection, sending the selected previously stored personalized information to the first mobile communication device from the computing device.

The Office Action asserts that Ishigami generally describes a computing device that receives requests to write information previously stored at the computing device, displaying a list of personalized information, receiving a user selection of personalized information and sending the selected personalized information to a mobile communication device. Even assuming, without conceding, that the above assertions are valid, Ishigami, Littig and Piosenka still fail to teach or suggest display of a selection interface from which user selections of previously stored personalized information are received. For example, even taking the Office Action's assertion that Ishigami displays a list of phone records as true, there is no teaching or suggestion that this list is a selection interface or that a user selects personalized information to transmit to a mobile communication device therefrom. At best, Ishigami merely describes computer 20 having a monitor 204 for displaying necessary information. Col. 4, ll. 36-39. Additionally, Applicants note that the search tables cited in the Office Action are not previously stored information and are, in fact, created after the data transfer has begun. *See, e.g.*, FIG. 6. The Office Action fails to address these previously submitted remarks.

Furthermore, none of the cited references teach or suggest that the previously stored personalized information is received from a mobile communication device different from the mobile communication device to which the data is being sent. The Office Action asserts that Littig describes a mobile communication device is able to transfer its information to another one and later the another one is able to transfer data information back to the mobile communication

device. Even assuming, without conceding, that such an assertion is valid, the Office Action's assertion relates to returning the data to the mobile device from which the data was received, not a different mobile communication device. Piosenka is similarly deficient. Piosenka describes a system whereby a user may program a cellular telephone using a personal computer. Abstract. Nowhere does Piosenka teach or suggest that the data programmed into the cellular telephone comprises previously stored information, much less previously stored information received from another mobile communication device. Accordingly, claim 78 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 83 and 87 recite feature similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 83 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 83.

Claims 79-82, 84-86 and 88-90 are dependent on claims 78, 83 and 87, respectively, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features cited therein. For example, claims 66, 81, 86 and 90 all relate to reformatting one or more information records including truncating each information record to fit within a data field size of a mobile communication device, each of the at least one information record corresponding to a single entry in the at least one of: the settings of the first mobile communication device, the calendar, the phonebook and the message. Neither Littig nor Ishigami teaches or suggests such features. The Office Action asserts Littig describes truncation at FIG. 6E, step 649. Applicants respectfully disagree. Even assuming, without conceding, that the transmission of the alleged only 20 repertories constitutes truncation of a larger set, there is still no teaching or suggestion that a set of 20 repertories constitutes an information record, wherein each information record corresponds to a single entry in at least one of mobile communication device settings, a calendar, a phonebook and a message. Indeed, the fact that Littig describes the alleged information record as 20 repertories clearly indicates that the set of repertories correspond to 20 individual repertories. Thus, the alleged truncation of the set of repertories does not constitute truncation of each individual repertory. Piosenka is also deficient in this respect. Accordingly, claims 66, 81, 86 and 90 are allowable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: January 22, 2010

By: /Chunhsi Andy Mu/
Chunhsi Andy Mu
Registration No. 58,216

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001